

**Minutes of the
Committee of Practitioners Meeting
April 30, 2015**

Call to Order

The webinar/conference call meeting of the ESEA Committee of Practitioners was called to order by Becky Guffin at 10:32 a.m. on April 30, 2015.

Attendance

Members present were: Becky Guffin, Becky Eeten, Michelle Glodt, Joan Pribyl, Katie Mellor, Chrissy Peterson, Lori Bouza, and Roxanne Lamphere.

Staff persons in attendance were: Laura Scheibe, Shannon Malone, Carol Bush, Jordan Dueis, Betsy Chapman, Jenifer Palmer, Yutzil Becker, and Laura Johnson Frame.

ESEA Student Growth Model

Laura Scheibe reviewed with the group the recommendations made by the Student Growth Work Group regarding how to translate the chosen model (Student Growth Percentiles (SGP)) into School Performance Index points for accountability, following the Work Group's most recent meeting in April. The Work Group's previous recommendations had been that half the points would be derived from the growth of all students and half from the bottom quartile of students. In April, the Work Group recommended that points be awarded based on the percentage of students projected (based on the model's calculations) to maintain proficiency or achieve proficiency within three years. Further, the Work Group recommended that included in that percentage be students who achieve "Very High Growth", defined by the Work Group as an SGP of 70 or higher despite not being on a trajectory to hit proficiency. The Work Group felt that although the data sampled from SD's 2012 and 2013 data indicated for most schools, including Very High Growth into the calculation did not have a substantial effect. However, the Work Group felt that it was important to include recognition for schools that are doing important work with their students who are so far behind. Scheibe then showed model data based on South Dakota's achievement scores from 2012 and 2013 to give the COP a sense of how this would play out for schools.

The COP members asked several clarifying questions, including expressing concern that the bottom quartile of students would be double counted in the model. Another member further asked why there was no additional weight for high achieving students. Scheibe took the question back; the Work Group in 2014 considered taking the bottom quartile out of the All Students figure. However, the Work Group decided that it is important for schools and stakeholders to know the "All Students" growth figure; taking the bottom quartile out of the calculation would not allow for that. It was also decided that it was important enough to focus attention on the lowest performers in a school that they be weighted as such in the model. The DOE will also be evaluating the model after several years of data to determine whether it is meeting the needs and is open to adjustments, if necessary.

Title I 1003(a) Funds

Malone advised the committee that the Department will receive \$1,738,692.00 in 1003(a) School Improvement funding for the next fiscal year with a carryover of funds. The Department will reserve 5% or \$86,934.00 from the top for the state level administration as allowed by the statute. The committee discussed the use of funds at the State level; activities include Statewide System of Support and direct support from the Department. The need for additional funds to support the School Support Team was discussed. From the remaining non-administrative amount, \$800,000 is a reasonable amount to be used by the SEA for the School Support Team to work with the newly identified Priority Schools and Focus Schools to be identified this fall. The remaining amount of approximately \$851,000 dollars will be allocated out to the Title I schools in school improvement according to federal law.

Motion by Guffin, second by Pribyl to hold \$800,000 of the 1003(a) School Improvement funds for use by the Department in providing support to the districts in improvement. Motion passed.

Adjournment

Motion by Peterson, second by Lamphere to adjourn the meeting at 11:15 a.m. Motion passed.